

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

JANUARY 3, 2013

AGENDA

CASES

- 1. OhioHealth Campus
12-041AFDP
(Approved 6 – 0)**

**6905, 6955 and 7450 Hospital Drive
Amended Final Development Plan**

- 2. Celtic Crossing
12-082CP
(Approved 7 – 0)**

**Hyland-Croy Road
Concept Plan**

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Richard Taylor, Amy Kramb, Warren Fishman, John Hardt, Victoria Newell, and Joe Budde. City representatives were Jennifer Readler, Steve Langworthy, Claudia Husak, Gary Gunderman, Justin Goodwin, Aaron Stanford, Jonathan Lee, Jordan Fromm, Eric Gayetsky, and Libby Farley.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved to accept the documents into the record as presented. Mr. Fishman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Amy Kramb requested an amendment to the December 6, 2012 meeting minutes on page 6, second paragraph, second sentence, 'That parking did not seem sufficient for unlimited restaurant space'. She also requested that on page 7, the second paragraph, first sentence be amended, 'Ms. Kramb suggested revising the outdoor patio furniture text to reflect what the Commission had previously approved', and to delete the clause in the third paragraph, second sentence, '...', but it is fine, because that is what they all look like around there.'

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved to accept the December 6, 2012 meeting minutes as amended. Mr. Fishman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Communications

Claudia Husak said that the Joint City Council and Planning and Zoning Commission meeting would be held on Thursday, January 17, 2013.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that both she and Mr. Fishman would not be able to attend the Joint Meeting, but that the other five Commissioners plan to attend.

Ms. Husak offered to discuss the electronic packet procedures if there were Commission questions or comments. [There were no questions or comments.]

Administrative Business

Ms. Husak said that just before the meeting, the applicants for Case 1 – OhioHealth, consented to the three conditions suggested in the Planning Report. Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if any Commissioner needed to hear the full presentation for the consent item. Amy Kramb said she would like to hear the presentation to better understand what signs were being proposed. Ms. Amorose Groomes announced that the two cases on the agenda would be heard in reverse order, Case 2 and 1. [The meeting minutes reflect the published agenda case order.] She briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

1. OhioHealth Campus 12-041AFDP

6905, 6955 and 7450 Hospital Drive Amended Final Development Plan

[John Hardt recused himself from this case due to a conflict of interest.]

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this request for a modification to the approved Sign and Graphics Plan for the OhioHealth Medical Campus including six new wall and ground signs. The site is located between Hospital Drive, Dublin Methodist Lane and Avery-Muirfield Drive in the OhioHealth Planned Unit Development District. She swore in those who wished to speak in regards to this case including Ben W. Hale, Jr., Smith and Hale, 37 West Broad Street, Columbus and Jim Lytle, Jim Lytle Consulting, 1665 West Case Road, Columbus; representing the applicant, OhioHealth Corporation, 180 East Broad Street, Columbus, and City representatives.

Claudia Husak presented the Planning Report. She said that at the August 9, 2012 Commission meeting this application for signs at the OhioHealth buildings at 6905 and 6955 Hospital Drive was tabled. She said the applicant made revisions to address the Commission's comments and concerns and came to realize that they had other sign needs they wanted to meet across the street for their medical office building at 7450 Hospital Drive. She presented a map of the site showing the OhioHealth Medical Campus which had an approved PUD text that covered it. She said that Subarea 1 included the Dublin Methodist Hospital and the attached Medical Office Building. She said Subarea 2 was the focus of the August application review by the Commission. She said the two existing medical office buildings within Subarea 2 lacked identification according to the applicant, and that due to change of tenants, the sign needs are more important.

Ms. Husak said that the applicant had provided an overall graphic, inventory and sign plan, and a shorter version, the subject of this application. She pointed out that the legend indicated blue circles for the brand new signs, yellow circles for the signs proposed to be removed as part of this application, and a white circle was a revision to an existing sign. She said different from what she was seen in August on the map, on the north side of Hospital Drive are newly proposed signs 07 and 08, and a sign by the pond for the 6955 Hospital Drive building no longer proposed as part of this application. Ms. Husak said the Urgent Care sign with the street number on it previously proposed for the building on the elevation facing Muirfield Drive has also been removed from this application. She said the four signs indicated on the map with blue circles and the sign indicated with a white circle were proposed all in August. Ms. Husak said the major change there was the proposed layout of this sign which rearranges some of the panels.

Ms. Husak explained that proposed Sign 02 was a ground primary directional sign intended to direct traffic campus-wide that included directions not only to the Hospital Drive buildings, but also to the Hospital and the Medical Office Building attached to the Hospital, and the Emergency Room. She said this type of sign at this type of location seemed to be contemplated in the existing Development Text as a sign at a major intersection decision point. She said the sign is proposed to be 10 feet 11 inches tall, and there were some changes made to the arrangement of the panels to highlight the Urgent Care, which the applicant contends is their most important wayfinding need as part of this application. Ms. Husak said

that Planning suggests a condition that if any of these proposed ground signs, particularly this one, is within an easement, the applicant obtains an easement encroachment form.

Ms. Husak said the signs proposed for 6955 Hospital Drive continues to be a wall sign over the canopy for the Sports Medicine entrance of the building, and secondarily, a wall sign for the Physician Offices in the building. She said that the applicant has explained that it is very important to differentiate the two entrances, particularly considering who would visit the sports medicine facility and getting patients who are not easily able to walk close to an entrance and not making them walk to the wrong entrance. Ms. Husak said the site is where the applicant is proposing to remove the existing 11-foot tall sign that is not visible.

Ms. Husak said for the 6905 Hospital Drive building, which will accommodate the Rainbow Pediatric Doctors office, the Urgent Care and other physicians' offices, the applicant continues to propose to raise the existing sign from six feet to nine feet so that it is more visible since it is sitting in front/behind a utility box. She said that the Commissioners indicated to the applicant that they preferred to see the sign relocated to the north side of the entry drive. Ms. Husak said that Planning agrees that relocating the existing sign is a better choice as the Sign and Graphics Plan does include any nine-foot tall signs. She said that the building identification signs are six feet tall, as is this existing sign today. Ms. Husak said also proposed in August for this building and included in this application, was a two-foot by two-foot six-inch Urgent Care sign by the entrance.

Ms. Husak said for the Medical Office building attached to the Hospital, an existing six-foot tall "Medical Office" sign is proposed to be removed and replaced with an Emergency Room identifier and the exact same dimension and design as Sign 08 at the other side of the building. She said those signs are seven feet two inches tall, which match the directional signs that are throughout the OhioHealth Medical Campus. She said the signs are consistent in terms of design, materials, and colors as are the existing signs on the Campus, and Planning is recommending approval of this Amended Final Development Plan application with three conditions:

- 1) That the height of Sign 05 remain at six feet and that the applicant be permitted to relocate the sign to the north side of the entry drive off Hospital Drive;
- 2) That the applicant include information regarding necessary easement encroachments with the sign permit application; and
- 3) That the applicant provides a landscape plan for each ground sign with the sign permit to demonstrate that each sign base is to be landscaped in accordance with the Zoning Code.

Ben W. Hale, Jr., Smith and Hale, representing the applicant, consented to the three conditions listed in the Planning Report. He said the proposed nine-foot tall sign will be moved across the entry drive and come back into compliance with Code. He explained that after the sign was installed the electric company placed a utility box in front of it so that it could not be seen. He said with the new entry off the freeway, it did not serve a purpose with northbound traffic, so it had to be remedied so the sign could be seen.

Richard Taylor asked if the new sign would be located across that entryway and if the applicant had agreed to keep it at six feet tall.

Mr. Hale confirmed that would be the sign's location and that the applicant agreed to keep it six feet tall.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comments regarding this application. [There was none.]

Mr. Taylor said he had no problem with the two interior signs proposed. He said his biggest concern with the application in August was the two-site approach and treating the areas differently, so he really appreciated that it was now only one site. He said he was okay with the newly proposed Sign 02 at the entrance and he had no problem with the remainder of the application.

Amy Kramb said knowing that the text does not limit the amount of verbiage or things they can put on these signs was a concern. She said there were five eight-foot tall signs on Hospital Drive within approximately one-quarter of a mile. She said she hoped there would not be lots of text placed on the signs. She said in general, she was fine with the application and the three conditions.

Warren Fishman said that he appreciated the number of signs that were needed at a hospital. He said he hoped that the signs would be kept simple and streamlined with a font as simple as possible. He said the Hospital building is impressive, and he hated for it to be cluttered with a lot of signs. He said the proposed signs seemed necessary for the Hospital and he had no problem with them.

Joe Budde referred to the proposed Physicians Office sign at the round portico entrance, and asked why the street address was not in the blue panel where there is a little arrow with no note to it. He said people will have a difficult time finding it if they do not know which street number it is.

Jim Lytle said that the same street number was used for entire building. He said that if they added the number on the sign, it would be redundant because it is included on the main identity sign in front and on the primary canopy as the main entrance for the building. He explained the entrance down farther is for sports medicine and their physicians only, and that there was an additional access through the main building that could be used.

Victoria Newell said overall, she was in support of this application. She said she thought the additional wayfinding signs were good. She agreed that when looking at the overall sign plan, that it was a large plethora of signs, but when driving through the site, it did not seem like she was bombarded with the signs everywhere. Ms. Newell complimented the applicant for removing the proposal for address signage along Avery-Muirfield Drive and removing the sign there.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Fishman moved to approve this Amended Final Development Plan because it meets the applicable review criteria and existing development standards with three conditions:

- 1) That the height of Sign 05 remain at six feet and that the applicant be permitted to relocate the sign to the north side of the entry drive off Hospital Drive;
- 2) That the applicant include information regarding necessary easement encroachments with the sign permit application; and
- 3) That the applicant provides a landscape plan for each ground sign with the sign permit to demonstrate that each sign base is to be landscaped in accordance with the Zoning Code.

Mr. Taylor seconded the motion.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; and Mr. Fishman, yes. (Approved 6 - 0.)

2. Celtic Crossing 12-082CP

Hyland-Croy Road Concept Plan

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this Concept Plan application for review of a new residential subdivision with 45 single family lots on 28 acres on the west side of Hyland-Croy Road, north of the intersection with Brand Road. She explained that Concept Plan applications offer the Commission the opportunity to provide non-binding feedback to the applicant and staff on proposals for a new Planned Unit Development.

Justin Goodwin presented this Concept Plan for a potential rezoning to a Planned Unit Development located on the western periphery of the City, west of Hyland-Croy Road, north of Mitchell-Dewitt Road, directly to the west of the Dublin Jerome High School practice fields. He said the site is surrounded by Jerome Township, and to the north and west is the Glacier Ridge Metro Park which includes a multi-use pathway system near the site. He said in the 2007 Community Plan, Future Land Use Map the site is cited as Rural Mixed Residential which recommends a maximum density of 1.5 dwelling units per acre, therefore this 28-acre site could yield 42 residential lots. He said the site is located within the Community Plan's Northwest Glacier Ridge Area Plan, updated in 2011 as part of the Hyland-Croy Corridor Character Study. He said the Hyland-Croy/Brand Road roundabout that is scheduled for construction this year will not impact this site.

Mr. Goodwin said this proposal is consistent with the recommendations of the Area Plan. He pointed out on the Area Plan graphic that there were intended Rural Character treatments shown along Hyland-Croy Road and that a portion of this site was visible in the image showing potential realignment of Hyland-Croy Road in the future. He said there were no immediate plans to do that, but the open space setback shown there is a more naturalized low-mow grass type of treatment, consistent with the Glacier Ridge Metro Park and some of the other treatments on open space frontages along Hyland-Croy Road. Mr. Goodwin said this area is also included on the Community Plan Roadway Character Map where Hyland-Croy Road and Mitchell-Dewitt Road are designated as Rural Character Roadways and there are a variety of design recommendations included in the Plan, including generous setbacks ranging from 100 to 200 feet, maintaining open views and vistas within and through development, informal and naturalized landscaping treatments, fencerow preservation, meandering bike paths, and naturalized ponds.

Mr. Goodwin described this site as generally flat, draining from north to south, surrounded on most of its perimeter by existing tree rows, particularly to the north and west along and adjacent to the Metro Park. He said there is also a stream running through the site with a designated Stream Corridor Protection Zone (SCPZ). He said the boundaries of this corridor are determined by Engineering through preliminary analysis. Mr. Goodwin said the applicant is working with Engineering to complete a more refined analysis and the result of it could yield adjustments to the stream corridor boundaries. He said a 150-foot high-tension power line easement runs through the corner of the site.

Mr. Goodwin explained that 7 of the 45 single-family lots will be located in the eastern portion of the site, east of the stream. He presented the concept plan showing the Stream Corridor Protection Zone where portions of some of the rear yards of the lots may encroach into portions of the SCPZ. He said the refined analysis being performed by the applicant will provide more information so that it can be understood how much encroachment will occur and whether or not adjustments will be necessary. Mr. Goodwin said the two access points will be at Hyland-Croy Road and Mitchell-DeWitt Road, connected by a street running through and across the stream. He said a cul-de-sac will provide access to the south in the eastern portion of the site, and a central loop street will be located to the west of the stream.

Mr. Goodwin said the applicant has proposed a minimum 200-foot wide open space setback along Hyland-Croy Road consistent with the Rural Roadway Character Guidelines, the recommendations of the Corridor Character Study, and the Northwest Area Plan. He said within that open space setback, a naturalized low-mow grass treatment is shown on the plan, consistent with recommendations of the Community Plan. He said portions of that area would abut the proposed stormwater retention wet pond in the open space setback. Mr. Goodwin said that the naturalized treatment would transition into more formal mown areas along the entry drive and the front cul-de-sac.

Mr. Goodwin said to the west, the proposed building setback is shown from the future right-of-way of Mitchell-Dewitt Road. He said the applicant has proposed a 35-foot setback that would include entry reserves on both sides of the access point and for a portion of the southwestern-most lot, the setback would be platted onto the rear corner of the lot. He said that Planning recommends the Commission discuss whether this approach is consistent with the recommendations of the Community Plan. He said

Mitchell-Dewitt Road also has a Rural Roadway Character designation. He said the applicant is proposing vegetative buffering in these open space reserves, along Lots 24 and 25, to screen those homes from the right-of-way. Mr. Goodwin said the applicant has noted that there are shorter setbacks from existing rural homes within Jerome Township along Mitchell-Dewitt Road as well. He said the rear corner of Lot 25 is proposed to intersect the future right-of-way of Mitchell-Dewitt Road as well. He demonstrated on the Concept Plan approximately where the 100-foot setback from the Mitchell-Dewitt Road right-of-way would be located and suggested that the Commission discuss this issue.

Mr. Goodwin said to the west of the stream corridor is another open space reserve area between the existing rural lots to the south and the proposed lots along the central loop street. He said this would also include a naturalized no-mow grass treatment, and would include stormwater treatment for the western portion of the site. He said that stormwater treatment would be provided through two wetland basins with a naturalized vegetative treatment connected together by a shallow swale. Mr. Goodwin said that at the narrowest portion of this reserve, it is about 60 feet from the existing site boundary to the nearest proposed lot line. He said that Planning and Engineering both support approaches such as this to implement sustainable stormwater treatment and more naturalized or low-maintenance landscape treatments; however, staff has concerns about the functionality and long-term maintenance issues that could arise with this treatment in this location. He said more information is needed to understand how this area would be accessed and maintained over the long run. He said it was very close to the residential lots, and there are concerns about potential conflicts between the homeowners and the more naturalized treatment in close proximity to their lots.

Mr. Goodwin said the applicant has proposed to install a two-rail, split rail fence within the open space reserve along the rear of all adjacent lots, to delineate where the lots end and where the reserve begins. He said that the applicant also proposes to extend the split rail fence treatment through the SCPZ to the rear of the lots that encroach partially within that zone. He said that will require additional analyses by Planning and Engineering.

Mr. Goodwin said existing multi-use paths are located to the east of Hyland-Croy Road along the Dublin Jerome High School practice fields, and to the west of the site within the Glacier Ridge Metro Park. He said is the path within the Glacier Ridge Metro Park crosses Mitchell-Dewitt Road to the west of the site and connects to the southern portion of park. Mr. Goodwin said the applicant proposes a multi-use path connection extending from the Hyland-Croy Road access point along the entry drive and across the stream, then connecting to another multi-use path running through the stream corridor protection zone and into the Glacier Ridge Metro Park. He said that the applicant is working with the Metro Parks to arrive at an agreement to construct a path extension along the north boundary of the site, feeding into the existing path system within the park. He said that the applicant also is proposing a formal pedestrian crossing at Hyland-Croy Road, providing connection to the existing path system to the east. He said they are proposing a pedestrian activated signal similar to the one at Tullymore Drive and Hyland-Croy Road. He said the applicant is working with the Engineering regarding that potential improvement.

Mr. Goodwin said that Planning and Engineering support these efforts to provide this continuous path connection, but there are additional path connections that should also be considered with this development. He pointed out that there was no path connection proposed along Hyland-Croy Road to the south property line. He said if there were a path connection, it would stub at the property line of an existing residential lot in Jerome Township. Mr. Goodwin said as mentioned earlier, the Brand Road roundabout will be constructed this year which will include a path connection around the roundabout itself, but not a path connection along Hyland-Croy Road. He said the expectation is that with future roadway improvements yet to be programmed, that path connection would be provided, so they would like to see a stubbed path that could be connected in the future to provide additional access for residents of this development to the south of Mitchell-Dewitt Road. Mr. Goodwin said this proposal also does not include a path to the west of the Mitchell-Dewitt Road access point. He said this location is very close to the existing Glacier Ridge Metro Park path crossing at Mitchell-Dewitt Road. He said staff recommends

considering another path connection which would provide a continuous loop system for residents of this development and another alternative access point to the Mitchell-Dewitt Crossing.

Mr. Goodwin said as described in the Planning Report, Planning recommends the Commission provide feedback on the following design issues warranting additional consideration:

- 1) Is the proposed number of lots (45) appropriate for this site based on the proposed site design?
- 2) Does the proposed building setback and landscape buffer along Mitchell-Dewitt Road adequately meet the intent of the Rural Roadway character guidelines?
- 3) Is the wetland stormwater system appropriate in the proposed location as it relates to nearby residential lots?
- 4) Should additional multi-use path connections be included in this development?

Ben W. Hale, Jr., Smith and Hale, representing the applicant, Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Interests, Ltd., said that they had worked closely with the Metro Parks and they are very excited about the proposed path because it provides an access to the park across from the school. He said they had further studied the stream, and based on the more defined studies, the width of the area needing to be protected is actually smaller than shown on their map, and the lots will no longer be in the Stream Corridor Protection Zone, subject to Engineering's approval. He said they will be required, as part of this development, to construct a left turn lane at the Hyland-Croy Road intersection, so that there will be improvement to Hyland-Croy Road to help people get in and out. Mr. Hale said all the lots in this proposed subdivision are 90 feet and can take side-loaded garages. He said they have committed that lots that front Hyland-Croy Road will have no stucco and all will have side-loaded garages. He said they had no problem with staff's suggestion that along Mitchell-Dewitt Road, they make another path there so that people can access the Metro Parks path system. He said Lot 25, because the SCPZ is smaller, can be moved back. He said the setbacks are consistent with the setbacks of the residences across the street and to the west.

Greg Chillog, The Edge Group, spoke regarding Lots 24 and 25 and the appropriate setback and/or treatment to maintain a rural character along that section of Mitchell-Dewitt Road. He defended the setback from the road for these lots by citing examples of the setbacks for surrounding rural homes. Mr. Chillog said as drawn on the current plan, the structure on Lot 24 is approximately 95 feet away from the edge of pavement and Lot 25 has a distance of about 70 feet from the edge of pavement. He pointed out that they were not the 35 or 40 feet that exists along portions of Mitchell-Dewitt Road, but were closer to the 75 to 90-foot range that is consistent along the north side of Mitchell-Dewitt Road. He also expected that the further study of the SCPZ would allow them to rework some lots and allow an even greater setback from Mitchell-Dewitt Road for Lots 24 and 25. He said they are planning on a planting buffer so that while driving along Mitchell-Dewitt Road, views will be focused into the wide-open area of the Metro Park. He said they believed the request for an additional stub of the path along that edge would fit into that area. He said within the buffer, they are proposing a strong evergreen screen from the front setback line to the rear of the lots, and in front of that, more deciduous ornamental-type trees to create a more rural and natural approach. He said they would also incorporate the same type of natural treatment that they anticipate on the east side, which is similar to what exists on Mitchell-Dewitt Road, including low-mow grass, wide open areas, and a few trees, but it would be a little more manicured around the areas that people are going to be in contact with such as around the sidewalk edges, lots, ponds, and entry features.

Mr. Chillog said the two ponds referred to in the Planning Report were wetland areas where they thought the best solution, given the proximity of the wetland research area and the other Metro Park wetland features, was to implement those types of stormwater management facilities. He said the stormwater areas would not be any larger or smaller than if they were wet ponds. He said however, changing to a dry facility would drastically increase the size that they would need to be, so they thought this was a good alternative.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if their preference was for wet or dry facilities.

Mr. Chillog said that they were proposing a wetland treatment which would be dry during portions of the year, and wet during the other portions of the year with very specific wetland-type plantings which would be monitored through an establishment period and maintained. He said there will be different areas within the facility. He said some of the areas will be wet most of the time and others will be inundated under a stormwater event. He said it was a solution not seen much in this area. He said they designed wetland shelves at Tartan West, behind the condominiums on the southwest side of the site. He said the wetland facilities will be located within a more naturalized environment that will not require much mowing or vehicular access to maintain them. Mr. Chillog said the short; two-rail split rail fence is proposed to help delineate the public open space area from the rear yards of the residential lots.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comments with respect to this Concept Plan application.

Jeremy Nutting, 7787 Mitchell-Dewitt Road, Plain City, Ohio, who lives across from the proposed entrance, said he had concerns with the Mitchell-Dewitt Road setback. He said that part of Mitchell-Dewitt Road should have as much of the rural character as Hyland-Croy Road with the Metro Park nearby. He said the path crosses Mitchell-Dewitt Road and opens into the field. He said the current layout shows Lots 24 and 25 very near the path in addition to being very near the road. He said it was not in keeping with many of the other great designs of other Dublin subdivisions. He said he also had concerns with the access on Mitchell-Dewitt Road, especially in the summer and spring when there is the most use of the bike path. He asked if a turn lane was proposed.

Mr. Goodwin confirmed that the preliminary analysis conducted by the applicant did not suggest that a turn lane on Mitchell-Dewitt Road was warranted.

Mr. Nutting was concerned it was not a safe area with the bike path, the 45 mph speed limit, the curve in Mitchell-Dewitt Road and traffic coming in and out of this proposed subdivision. He said even as it exists, he has seen some very close calls with bicyclists and pedestrians trying to cross Mitchell-Dewitt Road. He suggested it would be ideal not to have the access there or to have turn lanes with a safe access and sight lines. He said if the only access was at Hyland-Croy Road, that would provide additional setbacks and there could be a bike path access on that end for residents to use. He said preserving the character of the park was important because once it is gone, you cannot get it back.

Ms. Amorose Groomes, after checking for additional public comments, invited the Commissioners to ask questions or comment on issues that needed to be addressed, guided by the discussion points suggested in the Planning Report.

Warren Fishman said he appreciated that this was a difficult site to layout. He noted that the proposed density was under two units per acre which could not be said was too dense. He said the obstacles were the high-tension wires, the stream that has to be preserved, and the Mitchell-Dewitt Road access. He said he felt this had to have a 200-foot setback, not 100-foot. He said to maintain a natural setting, pine trees and a landscape buffer will not prevent the subdivision from being seen. He said although the existing houses, some of which were built 50 years ago, are closer to the road, this is a clean slate to work with now. He said the existing houses are on an acre to five acre or larger lots. Mr. Fishman said regarding Lots 24 and 25, he thought they should be located somewhere else in the subdivision. He said a much better treatment was needed at that corner of the site. He said they needed to make this a grand entrance like on Hyland-Croy Road to keep the natural appearance. Mr. Fishman said he also wanted to keep the houses as far as possible away from the stream.

Mr. Fishman asked if there would be a homeowners association to maintain the proposed split rail fence. He pointed out that throughout Dublin, even in established developments where they have associations; those kinds of fences are always in poor condition. He said he was concerned that there will be a good,

forced and funded association to maintain the fence. He said the wet/dry ponds will need an expert to maintain them rather than a typical lawn service hired by the association to mow the grass. Mr. Fishman reiterated that he thought the Mitchell-Dewitt setback needed to be 200 feet instead, and that it could easily be done by changing the location of Lots 24 and 25.

Joe Budde said he agreed that the number of lots was appropriate, but that the setback needs to be greater. He said he was concerned about Mr. Nutting's comments. He said he wondered if there was a way to eliminate the Mitchell-Dewitt Road access, have a 200-foot setback, and still maintain the proposed number of lots.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if two separate accesses would be required by the Fire Department.

Mr. Goodwin said the Fire Department expressed a preference to have two separate access points. He said the Fire Department would have to analyze if an access into a cul-de-sac would be adequate for emergencies from Hyland Croy Road. He said that staff supports having two separate access points.

Mr. Budde said he thought the proposed multi-use path connections made sense.

Victoria Newell said she was not overly concerned with the density in terms of housing, but she was concerned about Lots 24 and 25. She said she thought the setbacks for Lot 25 need to be preserved along the street frontage in particular, taking into account the No-Build Zones, the 35-foot setback, and Reserve 'E.' She explained that it was very common for the Board of Zoning Appeals to review setback variance applications when homeowners are pinned in so many directions and want amenities such as decks, play structures, or swimming pools.

Ms. Newell said she had a minor concern on Lot 7 in terms of the utility easement since it almost paralleled the property line of the site, and was overlapping the lot. She suggested that the property line and easement should line up with each other because they are so close as a courtesy for the homeowner since they really cannot do much in that area.

Ms. Newell said she liked the bikepath connection and extending it into the Metro Park. She said she saw merit in providing the connection along Mitchell-DeWitt Road and she was less concerned about the connection on Hyland-Croy Road because of how far into the future the City is planning. She said it has always bothered her when a path was created when there was a no bike or multi-use path that it would connect to in the near future.

Ms. Newell said she liked the idea of having the wetland area between a wet retention and dry detention area, but she was equally concerned how it was really going to be maintained and how the water is going to be truly filtered. She said EPA regulations had to be complied with, but the issue of how it will be landscaped and maintained in the future is different.

Amy Kramb said she was okay with the density. She agreed that Lots 24 and 25 should be eliminated to provide a larger setback and larger entrance. She said that also would provide room for the bike connection from the development to the Metro Park so that it would not feel squeezed in to give an open feel to the park. She said that the two proposed entrances would provide a better traffic flow than one entrance. Ms. Kramb said giving more room and open space at the Mitchell-Dewitt Road entrance would help visibility.

Ms. Kramb said she assumed that the northern path through the Metro Park, once built, would be owned by the Metro Parks who will maintain it. She said the new path added by the developer would probably be their responsibility coming out of the neighborhood on the south side. She said the paths should be constructed and maintained the same. Ms. Kramb said she was not in favor of locating the suggested

path along Hyland-Croy Road, because it is not known what the City will do with the road in the future and how it would fit.

Ms. Kramb said she liked the idea of the split-rail fence, but there definitely needed to be a buffer between the rear yards and the wetlands. She said that an access for maintenance would need to be considered if there was a split rail fence there.

John Hardt pointed out that the Community Plan recommends a density of 1.5 dwelling units per acre. He said if this density was lowered by removing a couple of lots, it would solve many of the problems mentioned. He encouraged the applicant to consider that change. He said the wetlands approach to stormwater management is okay with him. He said this idea of a grassy meadow with a split rail fence exists already in some areas of the Metro Park. He said that east of Hyland-Croy Road on Tullymore Drive there is an orphaned piece of land owned by Metro Parks that has exactly that situation, and he was not aware of any complaints from those neighbors.

Mr. Hardt said he agreed with the Planning recommendations about the connectivity on the paths with a couple of edits. He referred to the discussion about a signalized crosswalk similar to that at Hyland-Croy Road and Tullymore Drive. He said that as Mr. Nutting previously mentioned, there were many people using Mitchell-Dewitt Road as a path to get to the Metro Park. He said he has seen rollerbladers, bicyclists, and dog walkers in the road. He suggested that the path being proposed to the north of the site be brought directly out to Hyland-Croy Road rather than through the development, with a pedestrian crossing to the north to connect to the high school. He said he wondered if that might do a better job of providing a path to the Metro Park other than the roadway, and asked if Engineering thinks that the crossing needs to be at the intersection. He said he thought that option would give people a route to the Metro Park without them feeling like they have to go through the neighborhood. Mr. Hardt said he did not know if that was 'the' answer, but he was interested in having something like that explored. He said he also wondered why, realizing it would not connect very far today, there are not pathways along the steam corridor, as has been done in many other areas of the City. He said ultimately, paths end up being connected and the best bike paths follow the streams throughout the City.

Mr. Hardt said the southwest corner of the development was his biggest concern. He said the applicant did not create this problem, but the Metro Park path crossing is a nightmare. He said he had instances, particularly in the summer, when the trees are leafed out, where he has had to wait there when trying to cross the road and rely on his ears to tell him if a car was coming. He said he was concerned about the houses crowding the intersection, and particularly concerned about heavy landscaping in that location. He said he did not have a strong preference as far as what the setback ought to be dimensionally or precisely what the landscaping ought to be there. He said what he is more concerned about is that when it is done, there is an improved sightline on Mitchell-Dewitt Road either immediately at this development's entrance or at the Metro Park. He said as it exists, it was a disaster waiting to happen.

Richard Taylor said he had a concern about the density, but not because of the numbers. He said because of the way the applicant had to deal with the obstacles that exist on the site, that it is nice, open, and relaxed on the east side and then everything is crammed into the bottom at the west side. He said something needs to be rearranged so that the two lots are not as close to the road as shown, and eliminating the two lots would be the easiest solution. He suggested there might be a way to shuffle the lots around. He said the 200-foot setback on the eastern side of this property is wonderful, but it is across the street from the marshland near the Dublin Jerome High School stadium, and a large part of the high-tension line easement. He said if there were an arrangement of houses that encroached on that a little and eliminated the difficulty of the southwestern corner of the development, he would be willing to give up a little space in the 200-foot setback on Hyland-Croy Road because there will never be any additional development facing it across the road. He suggested rather than having the three north/south roads, there might be a way to have the bottom portion of the loop street extend further to the west, making one big loop, rearranging those lots, and having a stub road coming from that connection down

to Mitchell-Dewitt, without any lots on it. He said it seemed that way they could have almost, if not the same number of lots. Mr. Taylor said there would be a similar circulation on the site and the Mitchell-DeWitt intersection could be moved away from the corner the two lots would no longer be in that location. He said that it was not really the location of the property line that was the issue on these lots, but the location of the house. He said if lots along Mitchell-Dewitt were facing north, rather than east and west, they would be as if they had a large rear yard that would be counted in the setback area, which might solve some of that problem. He suggested that be considered.

Mr. Taylor said because there were so many obstacles on the site, he did not know if there was a way to deal with it, but it always seemed like a lost opportunity to him that these landscaped retention ponds with the fountains and other amenities are in front. He suggested instead locating this somewhere in the middle of the site where it can be an amenity for the residents of this development.

Mr. Taylor asked if the applicant's intention was to sell the lots to builders or was one developer going to build the homes. He also asked if it had been decided if there would be design guidelines for the houses.

Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Interests, 565 Metro Place South, Dublin, Ohio, said design guidelines have not been decided. He said they have been working with Planning to create a text that will have satisfactory standards. He said they are only developing the site and will not be building individual homes.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she thought all the comments made have been very valuable and she agreed with almost all of them. She said she thought it was important to keep the Mitchell-Dewitt Road intersection clear. She said if they could get to a density of 1.5 dwelling units per acre that would be preferable to her rather than pushing the limit which will become a standard practice. She said the Commission would like to be consistent and try to hold to that.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she had a great deal of concern about the wet and dry ponds. She said she was involved with the development at Dublin Jerome High School, where two of the worst wet/dry basins in the City are located. She said she thought when the Army Corps of Engineers selects a wetland mitigation site, and it is next door, that should tell a lot about the character of the soils in that area. Ms. Amorose Groomes said that they really need to get it right. She said she was not at all willing to even flex to something that may or may not be a great solution. She said the front area of the high school is a mess because they can never get into it to clean it out. Ms. Amorose Groomes said it was not really wet or dry. She said it had cattails, was unsightly, and probably unsafe, given the mosquito populations because it does not function as a living system. She said it is going to be very important to make whatever is done on this site function as living systems that cleanse and filter themselves rather than just stagnate and become problematic. Ms. Amorose Groomes said she would be interested in seeing what details the applicant brings forward. She said she did not think they could get them dry to make truly dry basins with the water table in the area. She said she doubted, given the site's proximity to the wetland mitigations in the Metro Park, that it would be feasible. Ms. Amorose Groomes said that they will have to figure out good ways to manage the wetland basins, which probably will involve working with someone on the State level to get that kind of information. She reiterated that she did not think they can be dry and they will have to be wet. She said that designing them to be made 'alive' is going to be very important.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she would not be averse to having a fee-in-lieu paid for some of the path construction that might serve the City's and community's long term needs. She said it would be nice to get some connectivity to the Metro Park from the high school and she would like to take advantage of those ideas, but in terms of north and south along Hyland-Croy Road, she thought a fee-in-lieu would be appropriate and the money can be put in the coffers so when that roadway gets addressed there are funds to put the pathways on this site.

Mr. Fishman asked if Ms. Amorose Grooms felt a homeowners association would be capable of maintaining the area if it was not a straight wet pond. He said he preferred a wet pond because they seemed to be easier to maintain.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said it was hard to say without seeing the design details.

Mr. Fishman said he would be opposed if the density was not below 1.5 dwelling units per acre. He said that the Commission did not want to set a dangerous precedent for future developments. He said he thought the entrance problem could be easily resolved if the proposed density was reduced.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said it was a nice development. She said she really appreciated the design and the difficulties that the site gives and the 90-foot lots. She said there are a few hurdles left to make it right, but she was supportive of a project like this on this piece of property.

Ms. Amorose Grooms invited additional questions or comments.

Mr. McCauley asked if Ms. Amorose Grooms preferred a wet pond rather than wetlands. He said that there is room and engineering said it will work just as every other wet pond in Dublin works. He said that their engineers said that this is a better environmental solution, but he wanted to do whatever is easiest and what the Commission wants.

Ms. Amorose Grooms noted that the wetland mitigation and the habitat were adjacent. She asked why a micro-habitat would develop there when there is a macro-habitat nearby. She said they are hard to design and manage. She said that the smaller they get, the harder they are, and these were really small. She said that is why when the Army Corps of Engineers picked out the Metro Park for wetland mitigation, it was designed to be large. She said she would not hesitate to see them just be a wet basin because there is a lot of habitat already in the vicinity, but that was just her thought.

Ms. Amorose Grooms thanked everyone and said after they worked with staff she looked forward to their return. She explained to the residents attending the meeting briefly about the next processes. She said if the applicant decides to pursue this development, they will continue to work with staff on many of the details they discussed tonight and will submit a formal application. She said those who received a notification of this hearing will be notified when the application is placed on the Commission Agenda. She said that the application will be reviewed by the Commission possibly two times, and then it would likely go to City Council another two times for a final action. She summarized that there would likely be four more public meetings held with regards to this proposed development before it would come to fruition.

Claudia Husak explained that notifications of this informal review were sent to property owners within a 300-foot radius of the site. She invited those who did not receive a notification to provide addresses to ensure that they will receive notice regarding any future hearings. Ms. Husak said case information is posted on the City's website.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said the Commission looked forward to seeing something soon from the applicant.

Commission Roundtable

Steve Langworthy announced that the State of the City will be held on March 14th, the same date as a scheduled Commission meeting. He said that alternate meeting dates will be sent to the Commission to consider and vote on a new date at the February meeting.

Ms. Amorose Grooms asked if there were any other comments. [There were none.] She adjourned the meeting at 8:01 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on February 7, 2013.